



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

11A
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/810,144 | 03/26/2004 | Charles E. Baldwin | 103850.000001 | 8858 |

7590 06/27/2006
Frederick H. Gribbell
FREDERICK H. GRIBBELL, LLC
Suite 120
10250 Alliance Road
Cincinnati, OH 45242

EXAMINER

LEE, SHUN K

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
| 2884 | |

DATE MAILED: 06/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/810,144

Applicant(s)

BALDWIN ET AL.

Examiner

Shun Lee

Art Unit

2884

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 19 June 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☒ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☒ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☒ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☒ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: 3-5, 8 and 9.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: 2, 6, 7, 10-12 and 16-18.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☐ Other: _____.


CONSTANTINE HANNEHER
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Continuation of 3. NOTE: the proposed amendment raises new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. Further, the amendment filed 19 June 2006 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132(a) because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132(a) states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows: "In these detector systems, the radiation source is positioned outside the container, the scintillation detector is positioned outside the container and the product having its level being detected is within the chamber as illustrated in FIG. 1 of the above noted U.S. Pat. No. 6,198,103. The quantity of radiation received by the scintillation detector is an indication of the level of the product within the container". It is noted that applicant argues that no new subject matter is being added by this amendment since this information was clearly disclosed in the prior art patent which itself was discussed in the Background of the Invention of the instant application. Examiner respectfully disagrees since a discussion of a prior art patent is not an incorporation by reference of the discussed prior art patent. Therefore, any insertion of new material from the prior art patent into an application constitutes new matter. In addition, there does not appear to be a written description of the proposed new claim limitations "a radiation source positioned exterior of said container" and "wherein said tubular member forming the scintillation chamber exhibits an inner diameter of at least 0.25 inches (0.635 cm)" in the application as filed. It is noted that applicant argues that a radiation source positioned exterior of a container is similar to the Houillion prior art patent discussed in the instant application. However as discussed above, any insertion of new material from a prior art patent into an application constitutes new matter. It is also noted that applicant argues the limitation of at least 0.635 cm is supported in the specification of the instant application on page 4, lines 31-34. Examiner respectfully disagrees. The specification states (pg. 4, lines 31-34) that "A one inch (2.54 cm) inside diameter is preferred, but tubing from one-fourth inch (0.635 cm) to four inches (10 cm) inside diameter may be employed for various applications". Therefore the specification, while being enabling for one-fourth inch (0.635 cm) to four inches (10 cm) inside diameter, does not reasonably provide enablement for an inner diameter of at least 0.635 cm.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: in response to applicant's argument that the present invention only needs a single level detector device and that single device will operate properly in a single dimension, a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. See *In re Casey*, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and *In re Otto*, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963). In addition, in response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., arranged in a single dimension) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).